UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,764	11/03/2003	Albert Sun	MXIC 1520-1	4234

22470	7590	01/03/2006

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER
PEERS, CHASE W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/699,764	SUN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chase Peers	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 December 2005_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16 and 18-32_ is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s)_17_is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _03 November 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 17 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper

dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the

claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The same functionality is already claimed in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors

Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology

Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S.

patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before

November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C.

102(e)).

Claims 1, 14, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Allegrucci (Pat No 6792527).

14,

1.   Regarding claims 1 and 20, Allegrucci teaches an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-41), a configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in configuration points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), storing instructions for the configuration load function used to receive configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array, storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

The examiner notes that the CSL cells in the prior art are configuration points, but are not listed as such. The examiner also notes that although the art does not expressly cite the use of a third memory array in the memory for the configuration function, the cited paragraphs show that this limitation is still covered through the use of the MSSIU, and consequently the memory, to the CSL cells.

Furthermore, the examiner notes that other prior mentioned in this Non-Final Reject can also be used as grounds for rejection against independent claims 1 and 20. This prior art includes, two patents by Sun et al. (5901330 and 6401221).

2.   Regarding claim 14, Allegrucci teaches of an interface between the processor and the configuration array that supports the configuration load function (column 2, lines 24-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 2-4 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allegrucci as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in view of Pani et al. (Pat No 5640344).

Allegrucci discloses an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-41), a configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in configuration points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), storing instructions for the configuration load function used to receive

configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array, storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly having the memory comprises a non-volatile memory store, a floating gate memory store, or a read only memory store.

Agrawal discloses having the memory comprises a non-volatile memory store, a read only memory store (column 2, lines 6-10), or a floating gate memory store (column 10, lines 1-14).

Allegrucci and Agrawal are analogous art because they both regard programmable memory for a system on a chip. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the memory be a non-volatile or floating gate memory. The suggestion for doing so would have been to store data for an extended period of time without worrying about powering the memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Agrawal and Allegrucci for the benefit of storage to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 20.

4.   Claims 5, 6, 24 and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Allegrucci as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in

view of Robb et al. (Pat No 5276839).

Allegrucci discloses an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-41), a

configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in configuration

points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to store

instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), storing

instructions for the configuration load function used to receive configuration data

via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load function used to

transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array, storing instructions in

a second memory array of said memory for the configuration load function used

to receive configuration data from an external source, storing instructions in a

third memory array for the configuration function used to transfer configuration

data to programmable configuration points in the configuration logic (column 3,

lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), configuring an integrated

circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to memory which executes

instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64) , and programmable, non-

volatile memory store (column 2, lines 38-40).

        Allegrucci does not disclose expressly a second store for the mission

function.

        Robb et al. discloses a second store for the mission function (column 3,

lines 43-49).

Allegrucci and Robb et al. are analogous art because they both regard

programmable memory for a system on a chip. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the

mission function in memory. The suggestion for doing so would have been for

easy access to the function by the processor. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Robb et al. and Allegrucci for the benefit of time-saving and

easy access to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 6, 24, and 25.

The examiner notes that although it does not expressly state that the

mission functions are stored on the memory, it must be noted that for the

processor to do its mission for the host system, it must load the mission functions

and mission data, which would come from the memory.

Claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 31, and 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Allegrucci as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in

view of Sun et al. (Pat No 6401221).

5.   Regarding claims 7, 8, 31, and 32, Allegrucci discloses an input port which

receives data (column 3, lines 36-41), a configuration logic array defined by

configuration data stored in configuration points in the configuration logic (column

2, lines 5-23), a memory to store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1

line 66 to column 2 line 4), storing instructions for the configuration load function

used to receive configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the

configuration load function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration

logic array, storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the

configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly a watchdog timer coupled to the CPU, a configuration function that includes using a timer to generate a reset on a response to an error, upon the initialization event, reexecuting the configuration load and configuration function.

Sun et al. discloses a watchdog timer coupled to the CPU (figure 1, item 122), a configuration function that includes using a timer to generate a reset on a response to an error, upon the initialization event, reexecuting the configuration load and configuration function (column 4, lines 15-19).

Allegrucci and Sun et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, an in circuit programming system that can run downloaded code and reset the system when necessary. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a watchdog timer and the functions that come with the timer. The suggestion for doing so would have been the ability to reset the system when an error occurs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sun et al. and Allegrucci for the benefit of resetting the system to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7, 8, 31, and 32.

6.   Regarding claims 18 and 19, Allegrucci discloses configuration logic

having configuration points to store configuration data (column 2, lines 5-23),

memory storing instructions executable by the processor (column 1 line 66 to

column 2 line 4), and including instructions for a configuration load function to

load configuration data from an external source (column 3, lines 28-41 and

column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly error recovery during loading of the

configuration data to the circuit including a processor, monitoring loading of

configuration data using the configuration load function in order to detect delay in

transmission of the configuration data form the remote host, restarting the

configuration load function if the delay exceeds timeout, and the step of

monitoring performed by using the watchdog timer on the integrated circuit and

coupled to the processor.

Sun et al. discloses error recovery during loading of the configuration data

to the circuit including a processor (column 2, lines 36-52), monitoring loading of

configuration data using the configuration load function in order to detect delay in

transmission of the configuration data form the remote host, restarting the

configuration load function if the delay exceeds timeout (column 4, lines 15-19),

and the step of monitoring performed by using the watchdog timer on the

integrated circuit and coupled to the processor (figure 1, item 122).

Allegrucci and Sun et al. are analogous art because they are from a

similar problem solving area, fault recovery on a system. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add

a watchdog timer and all the functions that go along with it. The suggestion for

doing so would have been system recovery in case of an error. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Sun et al. and Allegrucci for the benefit of

system recovery to obtain the invention as specified in claims 18 and 19.

7.   Claims 9, 15, and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Allegrucci as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in

view of Sun et al. (Pat No 5901330).

        Allegrucci discloses an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-

41), a configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in

configuration points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to

store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4),

storing instructions for the configuration load function used to receive

configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load

function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array,

storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the

configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external

source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function

used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the

configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line

4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to

memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly that the configuration load function
includes receiving encrypted configuration data via the input port and then
decrypting the configuration data.

Sun et al. discloses that the configuration load function includes receiving
encrypted configuration data via the input port and then decrypting the
configuration data (column 13, lines 59-66).

Allegrucci and Sun et al. are analogous art because they are from the
same field of endeavor, an in circuit programming system that can run
downloaded code and reset the system when necessary. At the time of the
invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to
encrypt the incoming data and then decrypt the data. The suggestion for doing so
would have been system security. Therefore, it would have been obvious to
combine Sun et al. and Allegrucci for the benefit of security to obtain the
invention as specified in claims 9, 15, and 26.

The examiner notes that the in-circuit programming and the configuration
load function perform the same function and are therefore not dissimilar enough
to differentiate given the known definitions of the two terms.

8.   Claims 10 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Allegrucci as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in view of
Lawman (Pat No 6028445).

Allegrucci discloses an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-
41), a configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in

configuration points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to

store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4),

storing instructions for the configuration load function used to receive

configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load

function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array,

storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the

configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external

source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function

used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the

configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line

4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to

memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly a configuration load function that

includes receiving compressed configuration data via an input port and then

decompressing the data.

Lawman discloses a configuration load function that includes receiving

compressed configuration data via an input port and then decompressing the

data (column 8, lines 12-33).

Allegrucci and Lawman are analogous art because both deal with

downloading data in a compressed format to a programmable device. At the time

of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

to allow the configuration load function to receive compressed data and to

decompress it. The suggestion for doing so would have been to save time and

bandwidth. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lawman and

Allegrucci for the benefit of time and bandwidth savings to obtain the invention as

specified in claims 10 and 27.

9.   Claims 11-13 and 28-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Allegrucci as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in

view of Trimberger (Pat No 6105105).

        Allegrucci discloses an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-

41), a configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in

configuration points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to

store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4),

storing instructions for the configuration load function used to receive

configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load

function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array,

storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the

configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external

source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function

used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the

configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line

4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to

memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly the configuration points comprising

either floating gate memory cells, non-volatile charge programmable memory

cells, or non-volatile programmable memory cells.

Trimberger discloses the configuration points comprising either floating

gate memory cells, non-volatile charge programmable memory cells, or non-

volatile programmable memory cells (column 4, lines 12-21).

Allegrucci and Trimberger are analogous art because they are both

processing systems that employ reconfigurable programmable logic. At the time

of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

to make the configuration points comprise floating gate or non-volatile memory

cells. The suggestion for doing so would have been to make sure the data can

survive a loss of power or reset to the system. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Trimberger and Allegrucci for the benefit of not losing data to

obtain the invention as specified in claims 11-13 and 28-30.

10.   Claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Allegrucci as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Akao et al. (Pat No

5900008).

Allegrucci discloses an input port which receives data (column 3, lines 36-

41), a configuration logic array defined by configuration data stored in

configuration points in the configuration logic (column 2, lines 5-23), a memory to

store instructions executable by the CPU (column 1 line 66 to column 2 line 4),

storing instructions for the configuration load function used to receive

configuration data via the input port, storing instructions for the configuration load

function used to transfer configuration data to the configuration logic array,

storing instructions in a second memory array of said memory for the

configuration load function used to receive configuration data from an external

source, storing instructions in a third memory array for the configuration function

used to transfer configuration data to programmable configuration points in the

configuration logic (column 3, lines 28-41 and column 1 line 66 to column 2 line

4), configuring an integrated circuit including a processor, a processor coupled to

memory which executes instructions from memory (column 2, lines 55-64).

Allegrucci does not disclose expressly having the memory include a

protected memory array storing instructions for a first configuration load function,

a second memory array storing instructions for a second configuration load

function, the first memory array protected from alteration by a programming

function, and the second memory accessible to be written/modified by the

programming function.

Akao et al. discloses having the memory include a protected memory

array storing instructions for a first configuration load function, a second memory

array storing instructions for a second configuration load function, the first

memory array protected from alteration by a programming function, and the

second memory accessible to be written/modified by the programming function.

Allegrucci and Akao et al. are analogous art because they are from a

similar problem solving area, processing systems that employ program areas and

protection for some of the areas. At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a protected memory area.

The suggestion for doing so would have been protect the data from accidental or

malicious overwrites/deletes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Akao et al. and Allegrucci for the benefit of data protection to obtain the invention

as specified in claim 16.

The examiner notes that Akao et al. does not expressly state protecting

the first configuration load function or not protecting the second configuration

load function, but that combining Akao et al. and Allegrucci would give anyone

with skill in the art motivation to protect one of the configuration load functions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Chase Peers whose telephone number is

(571) 272-6757. The examiner can normally be reached on from Monday to

Friday, 8AM to 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

PIERRE BATAILLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12\23\05